



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/696,879

10/30/2003

Siong Lee Lim

S104.12-0050/STL 11408

9110

27365

7590

06/30/2009

SEAGATE TECHNOLOGY LLC
C/O WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.
SUITE 1400
900 SECOND AVENUE SOUTH
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-3244

EXAMINER

PHAM, MINH CHAU THI

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1797

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/30/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte: SIONG LIM and CHEE CHAN

Application No. 10/696,879
Technology Center 1700

Mailed: June 30, 2009

Before TOI JOHNSON *Review Paralegal*
JOHNSON, *Review Paralegal*.

ORDER RETURNING UNDOCKETED APPEAL TO EXAMINER

This application was electronically received by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences on August 12, 2008. A review of the application revealed that it is not ready for docketing as an appeal. Accordingly, the application is herewith being returned to the Examiner to address the following matter requiring attention prior to docketing.

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

Grounds of Rejection

A review of the file finds that the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal of the claims as provided in the Examiner's Answer mailed October 18, 2007, under the heading "Grounds of rejection" is either unclear with the grounds of rejection of claims set forth in the Final Rejection mailed October 13, 2006. The grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal as provided in the Examiner's Answer must be consistent with the last Office action of record. *See also Manual of Patent Examining Procedure* (MPEP) § 1207.02 (8th ed. Rev. 6, Sept 2007) for details.

A review of the Examiner's Answer finds that the following statement of the grounds of rejection is not clearly identified in the Examiner's Answer "Grounds of rejection" section; Claims 1-10 and 12-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crowder et al (6,214,070 B1).

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that the application is returned to the Examiner to:

1) issue a PTOL-90 that includes the statement of rejection presented for review; and

Application No. 10/696,879

2) for such further action as may be appropriate.

If there are any questions pertaining to this Order, please contact the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences at 571-272-9797.

SEAGATE TECHNOLOGY LLC C/O WESTMAN
CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.
SUITE 1400
900 SECOND AVENUE SOUTH
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-3244